The Calton Hill, bearing so striking a resemblance to the Acropolis of Athens, would be admirably suited to the display of the majestic beauties of a restoration of the Parthenon. Inexhaustible quarries of the most beautiful and durable freestone in the vicinity offer materials for its construction equal in appearance to the finest marble. The architects and operative masons of Edinburgh are inferior to none in Great Britain, and have already proved themselves capable of executing the most delicate and difficult members of Grecian architecture. In erecting a great national structure, it is of the utmost consequence to fix on some model of known and approved excellence, which will admit of being executed on its full scale, and in all its grandeur. Had a composition with a dome been adopted, it must, however handsome, have presented but a paltry and diminutive imitation of St. Peter's at Rome, St. Paul's of London, or perhaps a caricature of the Pantheon. In the Ionic and Corinthian we could never hope to equal the new Louvre of Paris, or the splendid structures of Italy, and other countries of Europe. The unapproachable beauty and delicacy of our Gothic cathedrals, waiving all considerations of their cost, would have rendered any attempts in that style utterly hopeless. In selecting the Parthenon as our model, no such risk is incurred. The chaste, majestic, and faultless beauty of the Grecian Doric temple will eclipse the most costly and magnificent works of modern times. Provided the restoration be correctly executed, and accompanied with appropriate sculpture and pictorial decorations, a certain and glorious success must be achieved, the influence of which on the future efforts of national taste and genius in the three sister arts, it is impossible fully to appreciate.

The Walhalla of Ratisbon (Regensburg), the national monument of Germany, begun about 1830, and completed and inaugurated in 1842, is a Grecian octostyle Doric temple, with seventeen columns in the flanks, in imitation of the Parthenon. The whole is constructed of a hard limestone or marble from the mountains of Salsburg. When I visited it in 1839, the external architecture was finished, and the sculpture, by Rauch and Schwanthaler, were placed on the pediments, but boarded over. The interior was only bare walls. From the description, however, by the overseer, of the intended plans, the interior, it would appear, is one great hall, with an entrance at each front, exclusively destined for the reception of statues and busts of the great men of Germany, after death. There is a gallery supported by columns over each entrance in the great hall, on which are placed caryatides supporting the ceiling. There are likewise narrow galleries on the sides, connecting with those over the entrances, with a projection in the centre of each, having two caryatides supporting the ceiling. I saw two of the caryatides nearly finished in a shed where the sculptors were at work. They were of white marble, but the overseer told me they were to be stained, and partly gilt, in imitation of the ancient statues of ivory and gold. There is to be no pictorial decoration. The building is fire-proof, without a particle of wood in its construction, the roof being of iron and bronze, and the portals of bronze, or some less costly metal, adorned with sculpture. Under the structure are extensive substructions, in which are placed the statues or busts of eminent men living, which, after death, are transferred by a species of apotheosis to the upper temple. The Walhalla is placed on the brink of a hill close to the Danube, the principal approach being by a double flight of massive stairs and terraces up the steep ascent from the river. The effect of this confused mass of white marble, as I saw it from the opposite plain of the Danube, was most unseemly, and destroyed the beauty and unity of the temple from the very point of view which would have been the most striking and interesting. The Scottish national monument was projected and begun more than eight years before the Walhalla. Whether the king of Bavaria ever heard of the intended Scottish restoration is doubtful; but whether he did or not is of little consequence. Scotland is at all events entitled to the credit of having anticipated the plans of a prince universally acknowledged to be a man of the most refined taste, in all that regards art, in Europe.

English architects, and writers on architecture, are not backward in eulogising the perfection of Grecian architecture in the abstract, but both, with few exceptions, evince the most decided aversion to its being restored in its purity and true dimensions. No sooner was it announced that the Scottish National Monument was to be in its external architecture a restoration of the Parthenon, than all these gentlemen raised a simultaneous outcry against such an attempt as preposterous and too absurd to be listened to. The Quarterly Reviewers signalised themselves as their champions in a long and elaborate article in No. LIV. An able answer was made in the *Edinburgh Review*, No. LXXV. but not quite so full as the subject demanded. The following passage from the *Quarterly Review* affords a fair specimen of their mode of reasoning:—

"When employed by its authors and inventors, the architecture of Athens is faultless. The separate members of the building have a definite relation to the whole. They are aggregated by affinity, and connected by apposition. Each one is in its proper place: no one is extraneous or superfluous: all are characterised by fitness and propriety. Grecian Architecture is a composition of columns, which are intended to assemble themselves into the form of a Grecian temple. They seek to enter into no other combination. Beauty and elegance result from their union. The long unvaried horizontal line of entablature rests in stable tranquillity upon the even ranging columns below, and the conical shafts are repeated in unbroken symmetry. The edifice is perfect in itself, therefore it admits of no change in its plan, of no addition to its elevation. It must stand in virgin magnificence, unmated and alone. The Grecian temple may be compared to a single crystal, and to the process of crystallization. Disturb the arrangement of the molecules of the crystal, and they will set into a mis-shapen fragment. Increase the number of their crystals, allow them to fix themselves upon each other, and their individual regularity will be lost in the amorphous mass. Thus in the Grecian temple the component parts have settled themselves into a shape of perfect harmony, such as is required by their integral figure: but it is a shape that cannot be varied in its outline, nor can it be changed in its proportions. Neither does it submit to be annexed to any other. Every attempt that is made to blend the temple with any other design produces a lame and discordant effect. We must reject the arch, the noblest invention of architectural science. Porticoes cannot be duplicated. Doric columns cannot be raised in stories. No windows can open to the cella. No wing can be added to the right or to the left, which does not at once convince the observer that it has no real relationship to the centre which it obscures. No adaptation can be given which will reconcile it to utility. Plate-glass windows glaring through the intercolumniation; chimneys and chimney-pots arranged above the pediment, are just as appropriate as English nouns and verbs in a Greek hexameter."

All this is a mere tissue of truisms totally inapplicable to the subject in discussion; for on the assumption that the architecture of the Scottish National Monument is externally to be a classic restoration or fac simile of the Parthenon, all their truisms and poetic imagery fall to the ground. Indeed one would naturally suppose that it was intended as a satire on their own Anglo Greek buildings, which are characterised by the very faults, discordant combinations, and corruptions alluded to in the above passage. Grecian Architecture, according to the reviewers, is a composition of columns, which assemble themselves into the form of a Grecian temple, and seek to enter into no other combination. Were temples the only structures raised by the Greeks? Vitruvius describes various other combinations of columns,—the forum, with its numerous porticoes, colonnades, basilicæ, curiæ; the gymnasium or palæstra, with its xysta, extensive peristyles, halls, exhedræ, baths, &c.; the theatres, including their porticos and hypæthral walks. Even the Grecian temple itself assumes a great variety of form, proceeding not only from the different orders and degrees of intercolumniation, but from the several distinct species of temple, differing materially from each other in size, form, arrangement, richness of decoration, and disposition of the interior—from the simple temple in Antis, to the prostyle, amphiprostyle, peripteral, pseudoperipteral, dipteral, hypæthral, monopteral, circular—not to mention the extensive periboli which generally encircled the larger temples, embracing porticoes, galleries, statues, &c. In short, Grecian architecture included all the graceful variety of which columnar architecture was susceptible. Besides, are we to reject Grecian architecture, acknowledged by the reviewers to be so "faultless," "perfect," "beautiful," and "harmonious," because the arch cannot be introduced—porticoes cannot be duplicated—columns cannot be raised into stories—nor wings added—in short, because we cannot succeed in vitiating and corrupting it according to our own wayward fancies? Had the reviewers been consistent, they would have regarded the steeple or tower equally incompatible with Grecian architecture as the introduction of the arch, duplication of stories, or chimneys or chimney-pots surmounting the pediments. But, so far from this, we find, in a subsequent page, the following passage:—"There is considerable difficulty in combining a steeple with the Grecian and Roman architecture. Wren mastered the difficulty, and produced combinations scarcely inferior to the Gothic." This is disturbing with a vengeance "the primitive molecules of the crystal," if not making a barbarous and unwarrantable attack on "its virgin magnificence, unmated and alone."

The reviewers maintain that "the restoration of the Parthenon will teach nothing: the architectural student which he cannot learn from the accurate drawings with which he is presented by his contemporaries." But, admitting this proposition to a certain extent, of what avail is such a knowledge if it is never to be reduced to practice, but reserved for the libraries and portfolios of amateurs and professional men? Would it not equally apply to the Gothic, Italian, and other styles?*

GEORGE CLEGHORN.

BRITISH ARCHÆOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

ON Wednesday, June 9th, Mr. S. R. Solly, F.S.A. V.P. in the chair, Mr. Pidgeon exhibited two ancient chess-men of jet found in the Moot Hill, Warrington, Lancashire. Mr. Baigent made a further report of his progress in the discovery of mural paintings in St. John's Church, Winchester.

Drawings of various antiquities in the museum of Mr. Bateman, of Goulgreave, were exhibited by Mr. Brushfield; also a very curious reliquary set in a silver box, said to have been found in the stone coffin containing the remains of Benedict Biscop, obiit 703, in St. Peter's Monastery, at Monkwearmouth, Durham, during some alterations in 1803. It was accompanied by an interesting letter from the present proprietor, to whom it had been given by the person who took it out of the coffin; but the workmanship of the box was thought by several members to be of as late a date as the fourteenth century. The question therefore, arises, was it really the coffin of Benedict Biscop? If so, it must have been disturbed at some earlier period, and the reliquary at that time placed in the coffin, as it can scarcely be considered the work of the eighth century.

Mr. Rolfe exhibited two spurs, not a pair, but both of the Elizabethan period.

Mr. Burkitt read a paper on the ancient signs of houses in London, and enumerated many that still exist. The paper was full of curious and amusing matter, and very agreeably terminated the last public meeting of the session.

The chairman stated that the exact day in August for convening the congress at Newark could not be fixed until something more definitive was known respecting the dissolution and re-assembling of Parliament, and that the earliest notice would be given to the members, of the period that would be most convenient to his Grace the Duke of Newcastle. The society then adjourned to November 10th.

* To be continued.

To learn how to use OCR and PDF Compression go to our website